



Appl. No. 09/874,770

#7
7/27/02
SP

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO. 09/874,770

§ **ATTY DOCKET NO. 80191.00002**

INVENTORS: Watson et al.

§
§
§ **EXAMINER: Robert H. Muromoto, Jr.**

**TITLE: UMBILICAL CORD CLAMP
AND CUTTER**

§
§
§ **GROUP ART UNIT: 3765**

FILING DATE: June 5, 2001

§
§
§

Box ISSUE FEE

**Assistant Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Washington, D.C. 20231**

COMMENTS ON STATEMENT OF REASONS FOR ALLOWANCE

Sir:

Applicant hereby timely responds to the Examiner's Statement of Reasons for Allowance included with the Notice of Allowance and Fee(s) Due dated April 10, 2002. The Issue Fee is being submitted contemporaneously herewith. Additionally, although the Examiner did not require formal drawings, Applicant is submitting formal drawings to the Official Draftsman under separate cover contemporaneously with this submission. A copy of the formal drawings is enclosed herewith for the Examiner's convenience.

In the opening sentence of the Statement of Reasons for Allowance, the Examiner stated that Applicant's claims were allowed "because the instant invention recites a clamp for an umbilical cord that requires very specific construction parameters and elements." Applicant respectfully objects to such statement and requests that it be withdrawn. The claims speak for themselves and should not be mischaracterized as requiring "very specific construction parameters and elements." Such generalizations are inappropriate. See M.P.E.P. § 1302.14

(stating that "care must be taken to ensure that statements of reasons for allowance . . . are accurate, precise, and do not place unwarranted interpretations, whether broad or narrow, upon the claims.").

Additionally, with respect to claim 21, the Examiner incorrectly stated that the claim requires "a hinge connecting the strap to the *clamping surface*." (Emphasis added.) Instead, claim 21 recites "a hinge connecting said *clamp body* to said strap." (Emphasis added.) The Examiner's modification of the actual claim language is inappropriate.

Finally, with respect to claim 32, the Examiner stated that "claim 32 requires many specific limitations already stated in claims 1 and 21 with even more detail." As noted above, such generalizations are inappropriate. See M.P.E.P. § 1302.14. Again, claim 32 speaks for itself and should not be so mischaracterized. Additionally, the Examiner incorrectly stated that claim 32 requires that "the *clamping member* be shaped like the *face* of a koala." (Emphasis added.) Instead, claim 32 recites "a removable clamp . . . comprising a *clamp body* . . . having a shape resembling the *head* of a koala." (Emphasis added.) Once again, the Examiner's modification of the actual claim language is inappropriate.

Respectfully submitted,

Court B. Allen

Courtenay B. Allen
Reg. No. 43,469
Loeffler Jonas & Tuggey, LLP
755 E. Mulberry, Suite 200
San Antonio, Texas 78212
(210) 244-8848
(210) 354-4034 (Fax)
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT

Date: July 9, 2002